Appendix C. Statistical Methodology

MAIL LIST MODEL

Classification analysis was performed to predict the probability that an addressee on the 1992 mail list operated a farm, and thereby separated the preliminary mail list into probable farm and probable nonfarm classes. The analysis was used to reduce the preliminary census mail list of 3.78 million records to a final mail list size of 3.55 million records. All 3.55 million addresses on the final mail list received a census of agriculture report form.

Records from the 1987 final census mail list were used to build a 1992 prediction model for the 1992 analysis. Classification and Regression Trees (CART) software analyzed characteristics of known 1987 farm and nonfarm operations to determine which were most useful in predicting farm and nonfarm classes. Record characteristics such as the source of the mail list record, number of source lists on which the record appeared, expected value of agricultural sales, and geographic location were used to separate mail list records into model groups. (Sources included the previous agriculture census mail list, the Internal Revenue Service administrative records, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and special commodity lists.) The proportion of 1987 census farm records in each model group was calculated to provide an estimate of the probability that an addressee in the group operated a farm.

After the model groups were defined, each address record on the 1992 preliminary mail list was assigned to a model group by matching record characteristics to model group characteristics. Records belonging to the groups with the highest farm probability were those more likely to be farms according to the classification tree methodology. The model, followed by analyst reviews, was used to remove 229,700 records from the preliminary mail list (those in model groups with the lowest farm probability), and thereby designated the 3.55 million records with the highest farm probability to receive the census report form. This procedure was used to obtain a more complete census enumeration of farm operations without excessive respondent burden and data collection cost.

CENSUS SAMPLE DESIGN

Each of the 3.55 million name and address records on the census mail list was designated to receive one of three different types of report forms. The three forms were the nonsample form, the screener form, and the sample form. Sections 1 through 20 and 27 through 32 of the sample form are identical to sections on the nonsample form. The sample form, sections 21 through 26, contains additional questions on usage of fertilizers and chemicals, farm production expenditures, value of machinery and equipment, value of land and buildings, and farm-related income. The screener form is identical to the nonsample form with questions added in section 1 to allow quick identification of nonfarm addresses. These three different forms were used to reduce the response burden of the census, while providing reliable information on a large number of data items.

The sample form was mailed to all mail list records in Alaska, Hawaii, and Rhode Island, and to a sample of records in other States selected from the final mail list. Addresses were selected into the sample with certainty (1) if they were expected to have large total value of agricultural products sold or large acreage, (2) if they were multiunit operations (i.e., separate farms in more than one location), (3) if they had other special characteristics, or (4) if they were in a county with less than 100 farms in 1987. Other addresses in counties containing 100 to 199 farms in 1987 were systematically sampled at a rate of 1 in 2, and other addresses in counties containing 200 farms or more in 1987 were systematically sampled at a rate of 1 in 6. This differential sampling scheme was used to provide reliable data for the sample sections of the report form for all counties. When a nonsample large farm was identified during processing, a supplemental form that contained the additional sample data inquiries was mailed.

To determine which mail list records would receive the screener form, all mail list records not designated for the sample were sorted by model group farm probability as specified by the mail list model. The 412,000 mail list records in the model groups with the lowest probability of being farms and with an expected total value of agricultural product sales less than \$25,000 were designated to receive the screener report form. The remaining mail list records received the nonsample report form.

Whole Farm Nonresponse Estimation

A statistical estimation procedure was used to account for nonrespondent farm operators to the census. We excluded large and unique farm operations that received intensive telephone followup during census processing, assuming complete response from them. A stratified systematic sample of remaining census nonrespondents were contacted by enumerators using a computer-assisted telephone interview system. Five sample strata were defined based on expected value of sales, previous census status, and whether the record was identified by the mail list model to receive the screener report form. The nonresponse survey telephone interview was designed to provide sufficient information to determine the farm status of each record.

In situations where the nonresponse survey case could not be contacted, the contact person refused to cooperate, or when no phone number could be obtained, a census screener report form was sent by certified mail.

Estimates of the proportion of census nonrespondents that operated farms were made for each stratum in the State using survey results and applied to the total number of census nonrespondents in that stratum. The number of census nonrespondents that operated farms for each county by stratum was then derived. This estimation procedure is based on the assumption that the distribution of farms in a stratum by county is the same for census nonrespondents as for census respondents.

Certain census respondent farms which exhibited "rare" commodities were designated as "ineligible" to represent census nonrespondent farms and were excluded from the nonresponse weighting operation. The procedure explained below was performed with only the eligible respondent cases: Within each stratum in a county, a noninteger nonresponse weight was calculated and assigned to each eligible respondent farm record. The noninteger nonresponse weight is the ratio of the sum of the estimated number of nonrespondent farms from the nonresponse survey and the number of eligible census respondent farms to the number of eligible census respondent farms. Stratum controls were established to ensure that this weight was never greater than 2.0. The noninteger nonresponse weight was used in the calculation of the final weight for the sample items. The noninteger nonresponse weight was randomly rounded to an integer weight of either 1 or 2 for each record for tabulating the complete count items for publication.

Table A quantifies the effect of the nonresponse estimation procedure on selected census data items. The percentages in these tables are the percents of the census values contributed by nonresponse estimation. These indicate the potential for bias in published figures resulting from nonresponse to the census. The estimates provided in these tables do not reflect the effect of item nonresponse to individual census data items. The effect of item nonresponse is discussed in the Census Nonsampling Error section.

Table A. Percent of State Totals Contributed by Whole Farm Nonresponse Estimation: 1992

Item	Percent of total
Farmsnumber.	19.0
Land in farmsacres	12.1
Estimated market value of land and	
buildings ¹ \$1,000	11.8
Market value of agricultural products sold _\$1,000	3.9
Harvested croplandacres	10.2
Corn for grain or seedacres	21.5
Wheat for grainacres	_
Livestock and poultry inventory:	
Cattle and calvesnumber	10.9
Hogs and pigs number	6.0
Hens and pullets of laying agenumber.	.6

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

CENSUS SAMPLING ERROR

The sample for the 1992 Census of Agriculture is only one of a large number of possible samples of the same size that could have been selected using the same sample design. Sample refers to the sample for both the nonresponse survey and the selection of farms to receive the sample report forms. Estimates derived from all the possible samples would differ from each other only by random variation. In Rhode Island, sampling error in the census data results only from the nonresponse sample.

The standard error or sampling error of a survey estimate is a measure of the variation among the estimates from all possible samples and thus is a measure of the precision with which an estimate from a particular sample approximates the average result of all possible samples. The percent relative standard error of an estimate is defined as 100 times the standard error of the estimate divided by the value of the estimate.

If all possible samples were selected, each of the samples were surveyed under essentially the same conditions, and an estimate and its standard error were calculated from each sample, then:

- Approximately 90 percent of the intervals from 1.65 standard errors below the estimate to 1.65 standard errors above the estimate would include the average value of all possible samples.
- Approximately 95 percent of the intervals from 1.96 standard errors below the estimate to 1.96 standard errors above the estimate would include the average value of all possible samples.

The following example illustrates the computations necessary for producing a confidence interval for an estimate. Assume that the estimate of number of farms for a State is 94,382 and the relative standard error of the estimate is .1 percent (0.001). Multiplying 94,382 by 0.001 yields 94, the standard error; therefore, a 90-percent confidence interval is 94,227 to 94,537 (i.e., 94,382 plus or minus 1.65 x 94). If corresponding confidence intervals were constructed for

all possible samples of the same size and design, approximately 90 percent of these intervals would contain the figure obtained from a complete enumeration. Similarly, a 95-percent confidence interval is 94,198 to 94,566 (i.e., 94,382 plus or minus 1.96 x 94).

Census items were classified as either complete count or sample count items. In Rhode Island, both complete count and sample count items were asked of all farm operators. Examples of complete count items were land in farms, harvested cropland, livestock inventory and sales, crop acreage, quantities harvested and crop sales, land use, irrigation, government loans and payments, conservation acreage, type of organization, and operator characteristics. Sample count items were included under the following section headings: farm production expenditures, fertilizer and chemical usage, farm machinery and equipment, value of land and buildings, and farm-related income.

Table B provides the generalized reliability estimates of the estimated number of farms in a county reporting complete count and sample count items. These are derived from regression equations. The regression equation was fit with the estimated number of farms in a county reporting an item as the independent variable and the relative variance of that estimate as the dependent variable for all counties in the State.

Table B. Reliability Estimates for Number of Farms in a County Reporting a Complete Count Item or Sample Count Item: 1992

Farms	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
COMPLETE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting: 2550	5.4 3.0
75	1.6 1.4
150 200	1.1 1.0
300 500	.8 (X)
750 1,000 1,500	(X) (X) (X)
2,000	(X)
SAMPLE COUNT ITEM	
Number of farms reporting: 25	6.3
50	4.4
75	3.5
100	3.0
150	2.4
200 300	2.0 1.5
500	(X)
750	(X) (X)
1,000	(X)
1,500 2,000	(X) (X)

To illustrate the use of this table, assume that the estimate of the number of farms reporting hogs and pigs for a particular county, as given in county table 15, is 89. Since hogs and pigs is a complete count data item, refer to the first part of table B and use the estimated percent relative standard error of the estimate from the row with farm count equal to or just less than the estimated number of farms, 89. For this example, the percent relative standard error of the estimate comes from the row for 75 farms reporting. For sample count items, follow the same procedure using the second part of table B. Both parts of the table reflect the variability from the nonresponse survey for the items of interest.

Table C presents the percent relative standard error of selected State data items for all farms, and table D presents the percent relative standard error of selected State data items for all farms with sales of \$10,000 or more.

Table E presents the percent standard error for percent change in State totals from 1987 to 1992. The general purpose of the percent change estimate is to provide a relative measure of the difference in a characteristic between censuses. The relative change for a given characteristic is defined as the ratio of the difference of the 1992 and the 1987 estimate for that characteristic to the 1987 estimate. This ratio is multiplied by 100 to obtain the percent change. The percent standard error of a percent change estimate, then, is the standard error of the ratio multiplied by 100.

Table F presents the percent relative standard error for State and county totals for selected data items. The percent relative standard error of the estimate for the same item differs among counties in the State. Reasons for this are differences among counties in (1) the total number of farms, (2) the number of large farms included with certainty, (3) the size classifications of the farms sampled, (4) the amount of nonresponse, (5) the general agricultural characteristics, and (6) the specific characteristic being measured.

CENSUS NONSAMPLING ERROR

The accuracy of the census counts are affected jointly by sampling errors, described in the previous section, and nonsampling errors. Extensive efforts were made to compile a complete and accurate mail list for the census, to design an understandable report form with instructions, and to minimize processing errors through the use of quality control measures on specific operations. Nonsampling errors arise from incompleteness of the census mail list, duplication in the mail list, incorrect data reporting, errors in editing of reported data, and errors in imputation for missing data. These specific nonsampling errors are further discussed in this section. Evaluation studies are conducted to measure the extent of certain nonsampling errors such as coverage error and classification error.

Census Coverage

The main objective of the census of agriculture is to obtain a complete and accurate enumeration of U.S. farms with accurate data on all aspects of the agricultural operation. However, the high cost and availability of resources for enumeration place restrictions on feasible data collection methodologies. The past six agriculture censuses have been conducted by mail enumeration with telephone contact for selected nonrespondents. The completeness of such an enumeration thus depends to a large extent on the coverage of farm operations by the census mail list.

The past five censuses of agriculture have included approximately 91 percent of farms in the United States and approximately 96 percent of agriculture production. Complete enumeration of agricultural operations satisfying the farm definition of \$1,000 or more in agricultural sales is complicated by fluctuations in agricultural operations qualifying for enumeration, the variety of arrangements under which farms are operated, the multiplicity of names used by an operation, the number of operations in which an operator participates, the accuracy of data reporting, and other factors. A new mail list is compiled for each census because no current single list of agricultural operations is comprehensive.

An evaluation of census coverage has been conducted for each census of agriculture since 1945. The evaluation provides estimates of the completeness of census farm count and major census data items. In addition, the evaluation helps to identify problems in the census enumeration and provide information that can form the basis for improvements. The results of the 1992 Coverage Evaluation program will be published in volume 2, Subject Series (Part 2): Coverage Evaluation.

The evaluation of coverage for the 1992 census was designed to measure four components of error in the census mail list and in farm classification. Mail list error includes two components of error, a measurement of farms not on the census mail list (undercount) and a measurement of farms enumerated more than once in the census (overcount). Classification error includes two components of error, a measurement of farms classified as nonfarms in the census (undercount) and of nonfarms classified as farms in the census (overcount). Classification error arises from reporting and processing errors. Mail list undercount dominates all coverage errors. Net coverage error is defined as the difference between undercounted and overcounted farms. Measurements of these errors, as well as a description of the complete coverage program, will be available in the Coverage Evaluation report.

Mail List Coverage

A major problem with mail enumeration for the census of agriculture is the difficulty encountered in compiling a complete mail list. The percentage of farms included on the census mail list varies considerably by State. Several reasons have contributed to farm operator names not being included on the census mail list—the operation may have been started after the mail list was developed, the operation may be so small as not to appear in any of the agriculture-related source lists used in compiling the census list, or the operation may have been falsely classified as a nonfarm prior to mailout. A large proportion of the farms not included on the mail list are small in both acres and sales of agricultural products.

The 1992 Census of Agriculture Coverage Evaluation used the area segment sample of the 1992 June Agricultural Survey (JAS) of the National Agricultural Statistical Service (NASS) to estimate farms not on the census mail list. The Census Bureau contracted with NASS to augment the JAS data collection. The survey data collected by NASS was protected under the confidentiality of title 13, U.S. Code. These JAS survey records were matched to the census mail list. Records that did not match were mailed a census of agriculture report form to estimate mail list coverage. Estimates of farms not on the census mail list are computed using a capture-recapture dual frame estimator which will be described in the Coverage Evaluation report mentioned earlier.

Table G provides coverage evaluation estimates for one component of coverage error associated with the census of agriculture; that is, the error due to farms not on the census mail list. Also provided are estimates of selected characteristics of farms not on the mail list, estimates of characteristics of farms not on the mail list as a percentage of total farms in the State, and the percent relative standard error associated with each estimate. The estimate of total farms in the State is based on census farm count plus the estimated number of farms not on the census mail list. This estimate of total farms in the State was not adjusted for the components of error associated with classification and list duplication error. Estimates of these errors will be made at the regional, rather than the State level, and will be provided in the Coverage Evaluation report mentioned earlier.

Respondent and Enumerator Error

Incorrect or incomplete responses to the mailed census report form or to the questions posed by a telephone enumerator introduce error into the census data. Such incorrect information can lead, in some cases, to incorrect classification of farms. This type of reporting error is measured by the Classification Error Survey discussed later in this section. To reduce all types of reporting error, detailed instructions for completing the report form were provided to each addressee. Questions were phrased as clearly as possible based on tests of the census report form and each respondent's answers were checked for completeness and consistency.

Item Nonresponse

As information flows from data collection to tabulation, various types of item nonresponses are identified on the census report forms. Nonresponse to particular questions

on the census report form that logically should be present may create a type of nonsampling error in both complete count and sample count data. When information from reporting farms is used to edit or impute for item nonresponse, the data may be biased due to characteristics of the nonreporting respondents differing from those reporting the item. Any attempt to correct the data items may not completely reflect this difference either at the element level (individual farm operation) or on the average.

Processing Error

All phases of processing for each report form are sources for the introduction of nonsampling error. The processing of the report forms includes clerical screening for farm activity, computerized check-in of report forms and follow-up of nonrespondents, keying and transmittal of completed report forms, computerized editing of inconsistent and missing data, review and correction of individual records referred from the computer edit, review and correction of tabulated data, and electronic data processing. These operations undergo a number of quality control checks to ensure as accurate an application as possible, yet some errors are not detected and corrected.

Classification Error

An evaluation study of classification errors was conducted in the 1992 Census of Agriculture as part of the census coverage evaluation program. A sample of census mail list respondents was selected, and these addresses were reenumerated to determine whether they were a farm or nonfarm. A farm status determination was made based on the evaluation report form and compared with the census farm status which was based on the data reported on the report form. Differences in status were reconciled.

In past censuses, the proportion of farms undercounted due to classification errors was higher for farms with small values of sales. For the 1987 census, the classification error rate was higher for (1) farms with small values of sales, (2) farms with a small number of acres, (3) full-owner farms than part-owner or tenant farms, (4) operators with principal occupation other than farming, and (5) males than females. Results from the 1992 Classification Error Survey will be published in the Coverage Evaluation report.

EDITING DATA AND IMPUTATION FOR ITEM NONRESPONSE

The Census of Agriculture Complex Edit and Imputation System performs the following functions:

- Ensuring reasonable relationships between/among data items, values for various sizes of farms, and combinations of commodities.
- Ensuring necessary consistencies are present. There are more than 70 distinct consistency requirements.

Ensuring geographic, legal, and physical constraints are met

The system must perform these and similar functions for 900 data keycodes for sample records and 850 data keycodes for nonsample records.

For the 1992 Census of Agriculture, as in previous censuses, all reported data were keyed and then edited by computer. The edits were used to determine whether the reports met the minimum criteria to be counted as farms in the census. The complex edit and imputation system provided the basis for deciding to accept, impute (supply), delete, or alter the reported value for each data record item.

Whenever possible, edit imputations, deletions, and changes were based on component or related data on the respondent's report form. For some items, such as operator characteristics, data from the previous census were used when available. Values for other missing or unacceptable reported data items were calculated based on reported quantities and known price parameters.

When these and similar methods were not available and values had to be supplied, the imputation process used information reported for another farm operation in a geographically adjacent area with characteristics similar to those of the farm operation with incomplete data. For example, a farm operation that reported acres of corn harvested, but did not report quantity of corn harvested, was assigned the same bushels of corn per acre harvested as that of the last nearby farm with similar characteristics that reported acceptable yields during that particular execution of the computer edit. The imputation for missing items in each section of the report form was conducted separately; thus, assigned values for one operation could come from more than one respondent.

Prior to the imputation operation, a set of default values and relationships were assigned to the possible imputation variables. The relationships and values varied depending on the item being imputed. For example, different default values were assigned for several standard industrial classification and total value of sales categories when imputing hired farm labor expenses. These values and item relationships for the possible imputation variables were stored in the computer in a series of matrices.

Each execution of the computer edit consisted of records from only one State. The computer records were sorted by reported State and county. For a given execution of the edit, the stored entries in the various matrices were retained in memory only until a succeeding record having acceptable characteristics for some sections of the report form was processed by the computer. Then the acceptable responses of the succeeding operation replaced those previously stored. When a record processed through the edit had unreported or unacceptable data, the record was assigned the last acceptable ratio or response from an operation with a similar set of characteristics. Once each execution of the computer edit for a State was completed,

JOBNAME: No Job Name PAGE: 6 SESS: 17 OUTPUT: Thu May 12 13:49:01 1994 /pssw01/disk2/economic/ac92a/39/14apdxcri

the possible imputation variables were reset to the default values and relationships for subsequent executions.

After the initial computer edit, keyed reports not meeting the census farm definition were reviewed to ensure that the data were keyed correctly. Edit referrals were

generated for about 25 percent of the reports included as farms; they were reviewed for keying accuracy to ensure that the computer edit actions were correct. If the results of the computer edit were not acceptable, corrections were made and the record was reedited.

Table C. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1992

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

	Item					Total	estimate (percent)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS			,	FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES ¹			
Farms Land in farms		649 49 601	1.2 1.4	Total farm production expenses		649	1.7
Average size of farm	acres	76	1.8	Average per farm	\$1,000 dollars	32 436 49 978	.5 1.8
				Livestock and poultry purchased	forms	147	2.9
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD				Feed for livestock and poultry	\$1,000	1 130 288	1.3 2.4
PRODUCTS SOLD				Commercially mixed formula feeds	\$1,000	4 320 153	.8 2.8
Total sales (see text)	farms	649	1.2	Commercially mixed formula feeds	\$1,000	3 323	.6
Average per farm	\$1,000 dollars	39 512 60 882	.3 1.2	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and trees	farms	286	1.9
Farms by value of sales:				Commercial fertilizer	\$1,000 farms	1 348 408	.7 1.8
Less than \$1,000 (see text)	farms \$1.000	107 28	3.6 5.8	Agricultural chemicals	\$1,000 farms	1 332 307	.8 1.9
\$1,000 to \$2,499	farms \$1,000	68 111	4.5 4.7	Petroleum products	\$1,000 farms	904 607	.8 1.7
\$2,500 to \$4,999	farms \$1.000	115	3.5 3.5	·	\$1,000	1 487	.8
\$5,000 to \$9,999	farms	420 85	3.9	Electricity		441	1.7
\$10,000 to \$19,999	\$1,000 farms	590 76	4.0 3.5	Hired farm labor		733 237	.7 1.8
\$20,000 to \$24,999	\$1,000 farms	1 045 23	3.5 6.4	Contract labor	\$1,000 farms	9 076 55	.3 3.7
	\$1,000	512	6.4	Repair and maintenance	\$1.000	508 560	1.3 1.7
\$25,000 to \$39,999		36 1 075	4.8	Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery	\$1,000	2 406	.8
\$40,000 to \$49,999		13	4.7 8.0	and equipment	farms \$1,000	112 260	2.7 1.2
\$50,000 to \$99,999		564 49	8.0 3.4 3.2	Interest expense	farms \$1,000	196 1 473	2.1 1.6
\$100,000 to \$249,999		3 360 45	_	Secured by real estate	farms	145 1 193	2.5 1.8
\$250,000 to \$499,999		7 143 12	_	Not secured by real estate		82	2.8
\$500,000 or more	\$1,000 farms	4 296 20	_		\$1,000	280	1.4
Sales by commodity or commodity group:	\$1,000	20 369	-	Cash rent	farms \$1,000	141 909	2.2 .5
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops	\$1 000 l	424 27 431	1.4 .4	Property taxes	farms \$1,000	595 2 119	1.8 1.7 1.7
Grains	farms	12 (D)	8.1 (D)	All other farm production expenses	farms \$1,000	587 4 431	1.7 1.7 .5
Corn for grain	farms \$1,000	8 25	10.4 5.8		\$1,000	4 431	.5
Wheat	farms \$1,000		-				
Soybeans	farms	-	=	NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT) 1			
Sorghum for grain	\$1,000 farms	-	_	SALES FOR THE FARM ONLY (SEE TEXT)			
Barley	\$1,000 farms	-	_	Au c	.		
Oats				All farms	\$1.000	649 7 077	1.7 1.0
Other grains	\$1,000 farms	(D) 4	(D) 12.2	Average per farm	dollars	10 904	2.0
	\$1,000	(D)	(D)	Farms with net gains 2	_number \$1,000	296 9 755	1.8 .5
Cotton and cottonseed	farms \$1,000	-	_	Average net gain		32 956	1.9
Tobacco	farms \$1,000	-	_	Farms with net losses	number	353	2.4
Hay, silage, and field seeds	farms \$1,000	159 1 010	2.6 3.2	Average net loss	\$1,000 dollars	2 678 7 588	2.4 2.2 3.2
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons	\$1,000	126 2 461	2.6 1.4				
Fruits, nuts, and berries	farms \$1,000	91 2 322	3.2 1.7	GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME			
Nursery and greenhouse crops	farms	158	2.3				
Other crops	\$1,000	19 501	.4 4.8	Government payments	farms	60	2.7
Other crops	\$1,000	(D)	(D)	Other farm-related income 1	\$1,000	197 148	2.4 2.9
Livestock, poultry, and their products	farms	279	1.9	Customwork and other agricultural services	\$1,000	1 020	3.3 4.9
Poultry and poultry products	\$1,000 farms	12 082 52	.7 4.6 .3		\$1,000	431 36	3.4 5.0
Dairy products	\$1,000 farms	4 758 41	3.2	Forest products and Christmas trees	\$1.000	73 53	6.6 4.9
Cattle and calves	\$1,000 farms	5 024 162	1.4 2.5 2.5	Other farm-related income sources	\$1,000	215 40	7.8
Hogs and pigs	\$1,000	880 41	2.5 5.8	Onter farm-related income sources	\$1,000	301	4.5 7.3
Sheep, lambs, and wool	\$1,000	744 53	4.4 4.8				
Other livestock and livestock products (see	\$1,000	49	6.0	COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION			
text)	farms \$1,000	63 626	4.2 2.4	LOANS			
						1	

Table C. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1992 -Con.

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE				TENURE OF OPERATOR		
Total cropland		591	1.2	All operators farms acres	649 49 601	1.2 1.4
Harvested cropland	acres farms	24 411 517	1.1 1.3	Full owners farms	421	1.6
Farms by acres harvested:	acres	18 136	1.1	acres Part owners farms	25 498 162	2.2 2.1
1 to 9 acres		215	2.4 3.1	acres Tenantsfarms	20 473 66	1.9 3.6
10 to 19 acres		698 82	3.8	acres	3 630	3.1
20 to 29 acres	acres farms	1 069 51	3.9 4.7	OWNED AND DENTED LAND		
30 to 49 acres	acres farms	1 173 58	4.6 3.9	OWNED AND RENTED LAND		
00 10 10 40.00	acres	2 150	4.0	Land owned farms	583	1.3 1.7
50 to 99 acres	_farms	75	2.5	Owned land in farms farms	37 446 583	1.7 1.3
100 to 199 acres	acres	5 186 22	2.4 4.4	acres	36 663	1.7
200 to 499 acres	acres	(D) 12	(D)	Land rented or leased from othersfarms acres	228 13 372	1.8 1.6
	acres	3 794	_	Add Solution Individual I	584 228	2.0
500 to 999 acres	acres	2 (D)	(D)	Rented or leased land in farmsarmsacres	12 938	1.8 1.6
1,000 acres or more	farms acres	` <u>-</u>	` _	Land rented or leased to othersfarms	38	5.2
				acres	1 217	9.1
Cropland: Pasture or grazing only	_ farms	243	2.1	OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS		
Other cropland	acres	3 775 146	2.7 2.3	OFERATOR CHARACTERISTICS		
Culor diopland	acres	2 500	3.0	Operators by place of residence:		
Total woodland	farms	339	1.8	On farm operatedNot on farm operated	514 98	1.4 2.8
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and	acres	17 812	2.4	Not reported	37	5.3
woodland pastured		85	3.5	Operators by principal occupation: Farming	333	1.4
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etc.	acres farms	1 895 404	5.8 1.6	Other	316	2.0
Irrigated land	acres farms	5 483 132	2.5 2.2	Operators by days worked off farm:	222	4.0
3	acres	2 979	.7	Any 200 days or more	323 202	1.9 2.5
Acres irrigated:				Operators by sex:		
1 to 9 acres	acres	95 (D)	3.0 (D)	Male	559 45 405	1.2 1.4
10 to 49 acres	farms acres	(D) 23 583	(D) 3.8 3.5	Female farms acres	90 4 196	3.6 3.6
50 to 99 acres	farms	7	_			
100 to 199 acres		532 5	_	Average age of operatoryears	53.4	1.7
200 to 499 acres	acres farms	629 1	_	FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION		
500 to 999 acres	acres	(D)	(D)	TAKING BY THE OF ORGANIZATION		
1,000 acres or more	acres	(D)	(D)	Individual or family (sole proprietorship)farms acres	529 35 296	1.4
1,000 acres of filore	acres	=	_	Partnership farms	42	1.8 4.5
Harvested cropland irrigated	farms	129	2.2	Corporation:	5 316	3.7
	acres	2 961	.7	Family held farms acres	72 (D)	2.8 (D)
Pasture and other land irrigated	acres	5 18	12.3 12.0	More than 10 stockholdersfarms	1 71	2.9
Land under federal acreage reduction programs:				10 or less stockholdersfarms	''	
Diverted under annual commodity programs		-	-	Other than family heldfarms acres	1 (D)	35.0 (D)
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve	acres	-	_	More than 10 stockholdersfarms 10 or less stockholdersfarms	\ \frac{1}{1}	35.0
Programs	farms acres	9 462	6.8 .9			
				Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etcfarms acres	5 516	10.7 4.2
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS 1				HIDED FARM LABOR		
				HIRED FARM LABOR		
Estimated market value of land and buildings	\$1,000	649 312 677	1.7 1.4	Hired workers by days worked:		
Average per farm	dollars	481 783 6 304	2.2	150 days or morefarms	121 565	1.8 .7
Average per acre	Liuoliais	0 304	2.2	Less than 150 days farms workers	197 770	2.1 1.6
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT 1				INJURIES AND DEATHS		
Estimated market value of all machinery and		242		Farm-related injuries:		
equipment	\$1 000 l	649 24 479	1.7 1.4	Operator and family members farms	5 6	15.1
Average per farmdollars		37 718	2.2	number Hired workers farms	9	16.2
				number	11	-
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS ¹				Farm-related deaths:		
Opening and a familiary				Operator and family membersfarmsnumber	_	_
Commercial fertilizer	farms	404 14 835	1.8 1.2	Hired workers farms number_	-	_

Table C. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for All Farms: 1992 —Con.

		Relative			Relative
Item	Total	standard error of estimate (percent)	ltem	Total	standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS BY SIZE			LIVESTOCK		
1 to 9 acresfarms		3.1	Cattle and calves inventoryfarms	208	2.3
acresfarms	. 488 . 237	3.8 2.2	number Beef cows farms	6 057 133	1.7 3.0
acresfarms		2.4 3.7	number Milk cows farms	967 55	4.4 3.5
acres	. 4 056	3.7 4.2	number	2 565	1.7
acres	. 4 814	4.3	Cattle and calves soldfarms number	162 2 509	2.5 1.7
100 to 139 acresfarms		3.7 3.7	\$1,000	880	2.5
140 to 179 acresfarms		5.3	Hogs and pigs inventoryfarms number	48 5 488	5.2 3.3
acres	. 3 916 . 28	5.4 5.1	Hogs and pigs soldfarms number	41 6 011	5.8 5.0
acres_ 220 to 259 acresfarms _	5 491	5.0 8.5	\$1,000	744	4.4
acres	. (D)	(D)	Sheep and lambs of all ages inventoryfarms	62 1 355	4.6
260 to 499 acresfarmsfarms	. 8 179	4.7 4.3	number Sheep and lambs soldfarms	49	11.1 5.1
500 to 999 acresfarms		5.1 5.5	number	771	6.6
1,000 to 1,999 acresfarms		_	Horses and ponies inventoryfarms number	152 1 015	2.7 3.2
2,000 acres or morefarms	. (D)	(D)	Horses and ponies soldfarms number	24 108	6.9 5.9
2,000 acres of more acres		_	Turnber	100	5.5
			POULTRY		
FARMS BY STANDARD INDUSTRIAL					
CLASSIFICATION			Chickens 3 months old or older inventoryfarms	83 242 307	3.8
Cash grains (011) farms	. 2	24.3	number Hens and pullets of laying agefarms	83	.3 3.8
acres Field crops, except cash grains (013)farms	. (D)	(D) 3.2	number	242 095	.3
acres	. 12 127	2.6	Broilers and other meat-type chickens soldfarms number	5 (D)	16.2 (D)
Vegetables and melons (016)farmsacres	4 563	3.8 5.4		`	()
Fruits and tree nuts (017)farms		4.0 5.6	CROPS HARVESTED		
Horticultural specialties (018) farms acres	. 136	2.4 1.9			
General farms, primarily crop (019)farms	. 13	10.2	Corn for silage or green chopfarms	72	3.0
acres Livestock, except dairy, poultry, and animal		(D)	acres tons, green	2 949 49 638	2.3 1.8
specialties (021) farms acres		3.2 5.3	Irish potatoes farms acres	19 1 310	5.7 .2
Dairy farms (024) farms acres_	. 41	3.2 2.4	Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass	374 808	.1
Poultry and eggs (025) farms	. 21	6.6	silage, green chop, etc. (see text)farms	245	2.1
Animal specialties (027) farms	. 60	6.6 4.2	acres tons, dry	7 614 15 864	2.3 2.6
General farms, primarily livestock and animal	. 1 827	6.5	Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)farms acres	126 1 868	2.6 2.6
specialties (029) farms		14.8 14.5	Land in orchardsacres	72 664	3.6 4.5
acres	. 394	14.5	acres	004	4.5

¹Data are based on a sample of farms. ²Farms with total production expenses equal to market value of agricultural products sold are included as farms with gains of less than \$1,000.

Table D. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of \$10,000 or More: 1992

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

Item		Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
FARMS AND LAND IN FARMS			4 7	FARM PRODUCTION EXPENSES ¹		<u> </u>
Farms	number	274	1.2	Total farm production expensesfarms	274 29 478	1.6 .4
Land in farms Average size of farm		32 379 118	1.3 1.8	Average per farmdollars	107 583	1.6
				Livestock and poultry purchasedfarms \$1,000_	66 1 025	3.2 1.2 2.5
MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD				Feed for livestock and poultry	103 4 020 73 3 209	2.5 .8 2.8 .6
Total sales (see text)	farms	274	1.2	Seeds, bulbs, plants, and treesfarms	164 1 306	1.7 .6
Average per farm	\$1,000	38 364 140 014	.3 1.3	Commercial fertilizerfarms	216 1 195	1.7 .7
Farms by value of sales:				Agricultural chemicals farms \$1,000_ Petroleum products farms	190 866 271	1.8 .8 1.6
\$10,000 to \$19,999	\$1,000	76 1 045	3.5 3.5	\$1,000_ Electricity farms_	1 305 228	.7 1.6
\$20,000 to \$24,999	farms \$1,000	23 512	6.4 6.4	\$1,000_	655	.7
\$25,000 to \$39,999	farms \$1,000	36 1 075	4.8 4.7	Hired farm laborfarms	169	1.7
\$40,000 to \$49,999	farms \$1,000	13 564	8.0 8.0	\$1,000 Contract laborfarms	8 866 33	.3 3.2 1.3 1.6
	,***	304	0.0	\$1,000 Repair and maintenancefarms	491 259	1.3 1.6
\$50,000 to \$99,999	\$1.000	49 3 360	3.4 3.2	\$1,000 Customwork, machine hire, and rental of machinery	2 065	.7
\$100,000 to \$249,999	\$1.000	45 7 143	_	and equipmentfarms \$1,000	74 229	2.6 .8
\$250,000 to \$499,999	\$1,000	12 4 296		Interest expense farms \$1,000	129 1 246	1.8 1.3 2.3
\$500,000 or more	farms \$1,000	20 20 369		Secured by real estatefarms	89 980	1.5
Sales by commodity or commodity group: Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops	farms	216	1.5	Not secured by real estatefarms \$1,000	62 266	2.3 1.4
Grains	\$1.000	26 677 9	.4 7.7	Cash rent farms	102	2.0
Corn for grain	\$1,000	(D) 5	(D) 9.7	\$1,000	857	.4 1.6
Wheat	\$1,000	(D)	(D)	\$1,000 All other farm production expensesfarms_	1 267 271	1.6 1.6
Soybeans	\$1,000	_ _ _	- - -	\$1,000_	4 086	.5
Sorghum for grain		_	_	NET CASH RETURN FROM AGRICULTURAL		
Barley	\$1,000 farms	_	_	SALES FOR THE FARM UNIT (SEE TEXT) 1		
Oats		1	_			
Other grains	\$1,000 farms	(D) 4	(D) 12.2	All farmsnumber	274 8 886	1.6 .5
	\$1,000	(D)	(D)	Average per farmdollars	32 430	1.7
Cotton and cottonseed	farms \$1,000	_	_	Farms with net gains ² number \$1.000_	197 9 551	1.7 .5
Tobacco		-	_	Average net gaindollars	48 483	1.8
Hay, silage, and field seeds		59 692	3.2 4.3	Farms with net lossesnumber	77 665	3.2 2.9
Vegetables, sweet corn, and melons	forms	77	2.7	Average net lossdollars	8 639	4.3
Fruits, nuts, and berries	\$1,000	2 347	1.4 3.6			
Truits, nuts, and beines	\$1,000	2 218	1.7	GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS AND OTHER FARM-RELATED INCOME		
Nursery and greenhouse crops		105	2.4	TAKIII KEEATED INOOME		
Other crops	\$1,000 farms	19 303 18	.4 4.7	Government payments farms	40	1.4
	\$1,000	(D)	(D)	\$1,000 Other farm-related income ¹		1.4 3.3
Livestock, poultry, and their products	\$1,000	105 11 687	2.2 .7	\$1,000		3.4 6.9
Poultry and poultry products	\$1,000	23 4 723	5.1 .3	\$1,000 Gross cash rent or share paymentsfarms		3.6 5.6
Dairy products	\$1,000	38 5 011	.3 2.8 1.4	\$1,000 Forest products and Christmas treesfarms		4.5 8.2
Cattle and calves	\$1,000	73 698	2.5 2.8	\$1,000 Other farm-related income sourcesfarm		10.0 4.1
Hogs and pigs	farms \$1.000	18 707	7.4 4.6	\$1,000_		10.2
Sheep, lambs, and wool	farms \$1,000	8 3	11.1 14.9			
Other livestock and livestock products (see text)		18 545	6.6 2.5	COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS		
Value of agricultural products sold directly to individuals for human consumption (see text)	farms \$1,000	48 1 404	3.6 1.9	Totalfarms	_	= =

Table D. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of \$10,000 or More: 1992—Con.

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	ltem	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
LAND IN FARMS ACCORDING TO USE			FARMS BY TYPE OF ORGANIZATION		, ,
Total cropland farms	259	1.3	Individual or family (sole proprietorship)farms	195	1.6
acres Harvested cropland farms	17 840 250	1.1 1.3	acres Partnership farms	20 042	1.9 5.7
acres	14 170	1.3	acres	4 287	3.4
Cropland: Pasture or grazing only farms	79	2.5	Corporation: Family held farms	56	2.7
acres	(D)	(D)	acres	(D)	(D)
Total woodland farms	134	2.0	10 or less stockholdersfarms		2.8
Pastureland and rangeland other than cropland and	9 997	2.2	Other than family heldfarms		_
woodland pastured farms	33	4.6	acres More than 10 stockholdersfarms		_
Land in house lots, ponds, roads, wasteland, etcfarms	1 222 160	8.1 1.7	10 or less stockholdersfarms	-	-
Irrigated land farms	3 320 92	2.3 2.2	Other—cooperative, estate or trust, institutional, etcfarms	1 (2)	
acres Harvested cropland irrigatedfarms	2 904	.7	acres	(D)	(D)
acres	(D)	2.2 (D)	HIRED FARM LABOR		
Pasture and other land irrigatedfarms acres	(D)	(D)	Hired workers by days worked: 150 days or morefarms	103	1.5
	(5)	(5)	Workers	5/3	.7
Land under federal acreage reduction programs: Diverted under annual commodity programsfarms	-	_	Less than 150 days tarms workers	133 652	2.0 1.3
Conservation Reserve or Wetlands Reserve	-	_	INJURIES AND DEATHS		
Programs farms	8	5.3 (D)	Farm-related injuries:		
acres	(D)	(D)	Operator and family members farms	3	16.3
VALUE OF LAND AND BUILDINGS 1			number Hired workers farms	(D) 9	(D)
Estimated market value of land and buildingsfarms	274	1.6	number		_
\$1,000 Average per farmdollars	193 927 707 764	1.3 2.0	Farm-related deaths:		
Average per acredollars	5 989	1.9	Operator and family membersfarmsnumber	_	_
VALUE OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT ¹			Hired workers farmsnumber		_
			FARMS BY SIZE		
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment farms	274	1.6	1 to 9 acres	31	5.2
\$1,000 Average per farmdollars	17 613 64 282	1.3	10 to 49 acres	79	5.2 3.1
Average per famidollars	04 202	2.0	50 to 69 acres	21	4.6 4.8
AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS ¹			100 to 139 acres		3.3 4.6
Commercial fertilizer farms	215	1.7	180 to 219 acres	19	4.5
acres on which used	12 301	1.1	220 to 259 acres	5 21	8.5 4.9
TENURE OF OPERATOR			500 to 999 acres	8	_
All operators farms	274	1.2	2,000 acres or more		_
acres	32 379	1.3	FARMS BY STANDARD INDUSTRIAL		
Full owners farms acres	137 12 846	2.1 2.3	CLASSIFICATION		
Part owners farms	103	2.0 1.8	Cash grains (011)	1	_
acres Tenants farms	16 604 34	4.1	Field crops, except cash grains (013) Vegetables and melons (016) Fruits and tree nuts (017) Horticultural specialties (018)	30	4.1
acres	2 929	2.9	Fruits and tree nuts (017)	39 30	4.3 4.5
OWNED AND RENTED LAND			Horticultural specialties (018) General farms, primarily crop (019)	92	2.6 9.6
Land owned farms	240	1.4	Livestock, except dairy, poultry, and animal specialties		
acres	22 296 240	1.5 1.4	Dairy farms (024)	38	7.2 2.8
Owned land in farmsfarmsacres	22 069	1.4	Poultry and eggs (025) Animal specialties (027)	10	5.5 10.7
Land rented or leased from othersfarms	137	1.7	General farms, primarily livestock and animal		
acres landlords	10 582 426	1.5 2.2	specialties (029)	4	17.0
Rented or leased land in farmsfarms	137	1.7	LIVESTOCK		
acres	10 310	1.5	Cattle and calves inventoryfarms	79	2.5
Land rented or leased to othersfarms acres	17 499	5.6 9.1	number_ Beef cows farms_	4 618	1.6 4.2
3010022		0.1	number	363	5.8
OPERATOR CHARACTERISTICS			Milk cows farms number	40 2 524	2.8 1.7
Operators by place of residence:			Cattle and calves soldfarms	73	2.5
On farm operatedNot on farm operated	200 60	1.6 2.7	number	2 063	1.8
Not reported	14	7.4	\$1,000 Hogs and pigs inventoryfarms	20	2.8 6.7
Operators by principal occupation:			number Hogs and pigs soldfarms	5 226	3.4 7.4
FarmingOther	202 72	1.4 3.4	number	5 652	5.3
	, 2	5.4	\$1,000		4.6
Operators by days worked off farm: Any	90	2.9	Sheep and lambs of all ages inventoryfarms	115	11.1 12.8
200 days or more	52	4.0	Sheep and lambs soldfarms	7	12.7
Operators by sex:			number	57	14.1
Male Female	248 26	1.3 5.7	Horses and ponies inventoryfarms	39 294	4.2 6.2
			Horses and ponies soldfarms	9	9.9
Average age of operatoryears _	54.0	1.8	number	72	7.6

Table D. Reliability Estimates of State Totals for Farms With Sales of \$10,000 or More: 1992 - Con.

Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Item	Total	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
POULTRY			CROPS HARVESTED—Con.		
Chickens 3 months old or older inventoryfarms number Hens and pullets of laying agefarms number	21 (D) 21 238 387	5.8 (D) 5.8 .2	Irish potatoesfarmsacrescwt	13 1 298 372 405	5.7 .1 (L)
Broilers and other meat-type chickens soldfarmsnumber	4 (D)	16.4 (D)		96 4 364	2.3 3.0
CROPS HARVESTED			tons, dry Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)farms	10 604 77	3.4 2.7
Corn for silage or green chopfarms acres tons, green	48 2 464 42 973	2.7 2.0 1.3	Land in orchards	1 753 38 579	2.7 2.7 4.3 5.1

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.
²Farms with total production expenses equal to market value of agricultural products sold are included as farms with gains of less than \$1,000.

Table E. Reliability Estimates of Percent Change in State Totals: 1987 to 1992

	All fa	arms	Farms with sales o	f \$10,000 or more
ltem	Percent change from 1987 to 1992	Standard error of estimate	Percent change from 1987 to 1992	Standard error of estimate
Farmsnumber-		1.5 1.7	9.6	1.6
Land in farmsacres _ Average size of farmacres _ Estimated market value of land and buildings ¹:		2.4	11.4 1.7	2.0 2.3
Average per farmdollarsdollarsdollars	- - - 32.8	6.0 10.4	5.6 4.7	2.8 5.2
Estimated market value of all machinery and equipment 1: Average per farmdollars _	5.0	3.7	-14.9	2.3
Farms by size: 1 to 9 acres	_23	4.0	14.8	7.0
10 to 49 acres	_5.2	2.9 2.5	12.9 2.8	4.4 2.9
180 to 499 acres	-13.6	4.2	15.4	5.2
500 to 999 acres	. -	5.9		_
2,000 acres or more	-	=	-	=
Total croplandfarms _		1.7	15.1	1.8
acres_ Harvested croplandfarms _	_ -1.1	1.6 1.8	-1.2 17. <u>4</u>	1.4 1.9
acres_	-2.0	1.7	1.7	1.5
Irrigated landfarms_ acres_		3.5 .9	17.9 -15.2	3.1 .9
Vlarket value of agricultural products sold\$1,000	- 4.6 - 12.9	.6 2.0	4.7 -4.4	.5 1.5
Crops, including nursery and greenhouse crops \$1,000 Livestock, poultry, and their products \$1,000 -	2.8 8.8	.5 1.6	2.4 10.6	.5 1.5
Farms by value of sales:				
Less than \$2,500\$2,500 to \$4,999	. 45.6	1.6 7.7	(X) (X) (X)	(X) (X) (X) 5.8 6.7
\$5,000 to \$9,999 \$10,000 to \$24,999	. 3.7	5.6 5.8	(X) 25.3	(X)
\$25,000 to \$49,999	. 19.5	6.7	19.5	6.7
\$50,000 to \$99,999 \$100,000 to \$249,999	-10.9 4.7	4.6	-10.9 4.7	4.6
\$250,000 to \$499,999 \$500,000 or more	_20.0	_ _	-20.0 17.6	-
Total farm production expenses 1\$1,000	_ 9.1	2.2 3.0	11.5 -5.6	1.9 2.1
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the farm unit (see text) 1farms_		2.1	18.1	2.5
Net cash return from agricultural sales for the faith unit (see text)	_4.9	3.1 4.1	-5.2 -19.8	2.3 2.1 2.5
Operators by principal occupation:	0.5			4.0
Farming	-3.5 -11.2	2.0 2.4	4.1 28.6	1.8 5.5
Operators by days worked off farm:				
Any	-18.2 -22.9	4.4 4.3	12.5 23.8	6.5 7.9
Livestock and poultry: Cattle and calves inventory		2.5 2.4	-1.3 -12.4	3.5 2.3
Beef cowsfarms _	_14.7	3.5	37.0	9.2 9.0
number_ Milk cowsfarms_		5.2 3.8	-3.7 -25.9	3.1
number_		2.7	-13.9	2.6
Cattle and calves soldfarms _ number_		2.6 2.3	-7.6 -23.1	3.3 2.3
Hogs and pigs inventoryfarmsfarmsnumber_	_ 18.6	2.3 5.7 5.8	23.3	8.3 6.3 7.9 8.7
Hogs and pigs soldfarms _	_ 16.3	6.4	-10.0	7.9
Sheep and lambs inventoryfarms _	_ 18.4	8.3 5.0	25.0 -11.1	12.0
number_ Chickens 3 months old or older inventoryfarms _	_ 13.5	10.2 4.4	38.6 23.5	18.8 9.7
number_ Broilers and other meat-type chickens sold	_ 16.7	1.5 17.9 (D)	(D) 33.3 (D)	(D) 30.9 (D)
Selected crops harvested: Corn for grain or seed	, ,	23.3	266.7	61.0
acres. bushels_	_ 73.7	16.0 15.8	(D) (D)	(D)
Corn for silage or green chopfarms _	6.5	4.2	-2.0	(D) (D) 4.2 5.2 5.2
acres_ tons, green_	47.0	5.5 5.3	40.2 44.9	5.2 5.2
Irish potatoesfarms_ acres_ cwt.		6.9 1.9 3.3	-18.8 -6.8 44.4	5.8 1.9 3.3
Hay—alfalfa, other tame, small grain, wild, grass silage, green chop, etc. (see text)farms _		2.4	3.2	3.1
acres_ tons, dry_	6.3	3.2 4.1	3.0 23.1	4.1
Vegetables harvested for sale (see text)farms _	_ 27.3	5.1	35.1	5.3 5.2
acres_ Land in orchardsfarms _	_ -13.3	4.1 4.4	-1.8 15.2	3.5 7.4
acres_		5.5	-11.2	7.5

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

[For meaning of abbreviation	ons and symbols	, see introduc	ctory text]										
	Fa	rms		Land in farms	5	Average siz	ze of farm		market value o		stimated market nachinery and e		
Geographic area	Total (number)	Rela stand erro estim (perce	lard or of nate	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (acres)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	! :	/alue e	Relative tandard error of stimate percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Rhode Island _ Bristol Kent Newport Providence Washington	649 27 70 120 232 200		.9 1.4 1.1 1.3	49 601 1 468 5 636 9 631 12 408 20 458	1.4 1.7 2.7 2.6 2.2 2.2	76 54 81 80 53 102	1.8 1.9 3.0 2.8 2.6 2.5	666 520 676 3 303	783 476 721 582 354 319	2.2 4.2 6.1 4.0 3.7 3.4	24 479 930 2 111 5 462 6 938 9 037	1.4 3.2 4.2 2.9 3.0 1.6	
	Average mark machinery and fa			et value of agri products solo		Average man agricultural pro far	ducts sold per		Farm production expenses ¹				
									Total fa	arm production	expenses		
Geographic area									Farms		Value		
	sta er		tive lard or of nate ent) (Total (\$1,000)		Value (dollars)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	1	s	Relative tandard error of stimate percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Rhode Island _ Bristol Kent Newport Providence Washington	37 718 34 456 30 156 45 519 29 904 45 187		5.0 6.0 4.2 3.9	39 512 2 095 2 501 11 710 8 388 14 819	.3 1.2 1.6 .5 .8 .3	60 882 77 595 35 723 97 584 36 156 74 093	1.2 1.5 2.1 1.2 1.5 1.3	5 2	649 27 70 120 232 200	1.7 3.8 4.3 3.1 2.5 2.5	32 436 1 453 1 985 9 708 7 180 12 110	.5 1.2 2.5 .7 1.1 .6	
	Farm production expenses ¹ —Con.												
	Live	estock and po	ultry purchase	d		Feed for livesto	ck and poultry		Se	eds, bulbs, pla	ants, and trees		
Geographic area	Farm	s	Va	lue		Farms	Valu	ie	Fa	ms	Va	Value	
0 ,	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Numb	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Rhode Island _ Bristol Kent Newport Providence Washington	147 6 12 24 50 55	2.9 7.7 9.7 7.3 4.7 4.5	1 130 (D) (D) 191 617 252	1.3 (D) (D) 5.6 1.0 2.5	10	88 9 7.3 9 7.3 32 5.9 47 5.3 00 3.6 00 3.6	4 320 162 186 694 1 800 1 479	. 8 .3 3.4 3.8 .5 1.1	286 18 29 60 94 85	1.9 4.3 6.0 3.6 3.2 3.1	1 348 17 44 691 130 466	.7 2.1 3.7 .3 4.7 1.2	
						Farm production	expenses 1—Co	n.					
		Commercia	al fertilizer			Agricultura	l chemicals			Petroleur	n products		
Geographic area	Farm	s	Va	lue		Farms	Valu	ie	Fa	ms	Va	lue	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Numb	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Rhode Island _ Bristol Kent Newport Providence Washington	408 22 36 81 145 124	1.8 3.8 5.5 3.5 2.8 2.8	1 332 51 117 457 174 533	.8 .3 3.9 1.3 2.8 1.1		07 1.9 16 4.8 33 6.1 69 3.5 98 3.0 91 3.0	904 22 107 263 158 354	.8 1.2 1.8 .8 3.9 .7	607 27 65 114 219 182	1.7 3.8 4.5 3.1 2.4 2.6	1 487 71 125 399 314 578	.8 1.1 4.4 1.3 1.8	
					1	Farm production	expenses 1—Co	n.	T				
		Elect	-				rm labor				ct labor		
Geographic area	Farm		Va	lue		Farms	Valu		Fai	ms	Va	ılue	
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Numb	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	
Rhode Island Bristol Kent Newport Providence Washington	441 21 40 86 153 141	1.7 3.6 5.6 3.2 2.6 2.7	733 23 37 183 184 307	.7 3.4 4.0 1.2 1.9	6	37 1.8 6 7.7 27 5.9 60 3.3 73 3.1 71 3.0	9 076 (D) (D) 4 098 1 131 2 880	.3 (D) (D) .1 1.5 .3	55 1 5 10 21 18	3.7 32.5 9.4 8.6 6.1 6.4	508 (D) (D) 49 77 274	1.3 (D) (D) .6 4.7 2.0	

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

[1 of filearing of abbreviation		-,	otory tom									
					Fa	rm production	expenses 1—Co	on.				
		Repair and r	naintenance		Customworl	k, machine hire and equ	e, and rental of r uipment	nachinery		Interest 6	expense	
Geographic area	Farr	ns	Val	lue	Far	ms	Val	ue	Far	rms	Val	ue
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Rhode Island _ Bristol Kent Newport Providence Washington	560 27 57 103 208 165	1.7 3.8 4.6 3.2 2.5 2.7	2 406 97 202 573 455 1 079	.8 1.4 2.8 1.1 2.2 1.0	112 7 15 17 30 43	2.7 6.6 7.6 5.3 5.3 4.6	260 7 79 34 46 93	1.2 7.2 .9 2.9 4.6 1.9	196 11 14 36 63 72	2.1 3.0 7.2 4.3 3.8 3.3	1 473 37 71 280 301 785	1.6 2.3 6.7 3.7 4.5 1.8
					Fa	rm production	expenses 1—Co	on.				
		Cash	rent			Property to	axes paid		All	other farm prod	uction expense	s
Geographic area	Farr	ns	Val	ue	Far	ms	Val	ue	Far	rms	Val	ue
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Rhode Island _ Bristol Kent Newport Providence Washington	141 12 11 42 27 49	2.2 3.9 10.3 4.2 4.5 3.6	909 87 19 288 116 399	.5 .2 8.9 .7 1.8	595 23 65 103 215 189	1.8 4.2 4.5 3.3 2.5 2.6	2 119 68 279 424 632 715	1.7 1.8 5.9 3.4 2.9 2.4	587 26 61 104 215 181	1.7 3.7 4.5 3.2 2.5 2.6	4 431 123 264 1 083 1 046 1 915	. 5 4.3 2.4 .8 1.4
	Net cash return	n from agricult (see	ural sales for th	ne farm unit		Total cr	opland			Harvested	cropland	
	Farr	· ·	Val	lue	Far	ms	Acr	es	Far	ms	Acr	es
Geographic area	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (\$1,000)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Rhode Island Bristol Kent Providence Washington Washington	649 27 70 120 232 200	1.7 3.8 4.3 3.1 2.5 2.5	7 077 (D) (D) 2 002 1 208 2 709	1.0 (D) (D) 1.7 3.5 1.2	591 26 61 114 207 183	1.2 1.6 2.2 1.3 1.5	24 411 1 227 2 319 6 864 4 716 9 285	1.1 1.6 4.9 2.0 2.0 1.4	517 25 55 103 186 148	1.3 1.7 2.8 1.7 1.6 1.8	18 136 876 1 844 5 229 3 763 6 424	1.1 .8 5.7 1.8 2.1 1.2
		Irrigate	ed land		'			Livestock a	and poultry			
	Form		Λ αν			Cattle and ca	lves inventory		Beef cows inventory			
Geographic area	Farr	ns	Acı	ies	Fai	ms	То	tal	Fa	ırms	То	tal
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Rhode Island _ Bristol	132 7	2.2 8.7	2 979 43	. 7 1.4	208 11	2.3 4.5	6 057 416			3.0 7.6	967 69	4.4 2.7
Kent Newport Providence Washington	17 19 43 46	8.0 2.5 3.9 3.5	228 441 310 1 957	.9 .1 5.8 .6	19 38 76 64	6.3 4.7 3.6 3.5	598 1 742 1 222 2 079	7.5 3.6 3.0	10 17 56	9.9 7.9	191 135 339 233	13.4 14.5 6.5 5.6
						Livestock and	poultry -Con.					
		Milk cows	inventory			Hogs and pig	gs inventory			Sheep and lam	bs inventory	
Geographic area	Farr	ns	Tot	tal	Far	ms	Tot	al	Far	ms	Tot	al
	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)
Rhode Island _ Bristol Kent Newport Providence Washington	55 4 6 16 12 17	3.5 8.7 11.2 7.4 8.0 5.0	2 565 172 175 990 392 836	1.7 .4 1.2 3.6 2.0 2.6	48 1 8 7 19 13	5.2 35.0 10.8 13.2 8.2 10.1	5 488 (D) 574 (D) 4 071 222	3.3 (D) 19.6 (D) 3.4 13.7	62 2 4 11 23 22	4.6 17.5 14.6 10.9 7.5 7.0	1 355 (D) 46 (D) 809 305	11.1 (D) 15.3 (D) 17.9 9.3

Table F. Reliability Estimates for the State and County Totals: 1992 —Con.

[For meaning of abbreviation	ons and symb	ols, see in	ntroductory text]														
						ı	Livestock and	poultry -Cor	١.								
			Hens and pullets of	laying age i	nventory				E	Broilers	and other me	at-type chicke	ens sold				
Geographic area		Farm	ns		То	tal			Far	ms			То	tal			
	N	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		Number	Number		Number			Relative standard error of estimate (percent	d f e	Number		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		
Rhode Island _ Bristol Kent Newport Providence Washington		83 3 10 9 32 29	3.8 15.1 9.3 12.8 5.6 6.1		242 095 84 3 225 (D) 132 548 (D)		84 3 225 (D) 132 548		.3 17.4 17.5 (D) .1 (D)		5 - 1 2 2		16.: 47.: 22.: 24.:	- - 1 1	(D) - (D) (D) (D)		(D) - (D) (D) (D)
-							Selected cro	ps harvested									
			Corn for g	ain or seed						(Corn for silage	or green cho	р				
Geographic area	Farms Acres		S		Quantit	y	Far	ms		Acre	es	Quantity					
	Number	Relating standa error estima (percer	of ate	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Bushels		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Rela stand erro estin (perc	lard or of nate	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Tons,	green	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		
Rhode Island _ Bristol Kent Newport Providence Washington	16 1 1 3 1 10	50	- (D) 5.7 38 - (D)	7.6 (D) (D) 17.4 (D) 14.0	11 280 (D (D 1 780 (D 5 050		6.7 (D) (22.2 (D) 12.5	72 4 12 20 15 21		3.0 - 8.4 5.9 7.1 4.9	2 949 133 335 1 283 379 819	2.3 - 9.4 4.2 3.7 2.3	2	9 638 2 161 5 325 0 172 5 732 6 248	1.8 		
						Se	lected crops I	harvested -C	on.								
			Irish p		Hay – alfalfa	a, other to	ame, si	mall grain, wile	d, grass silage	e, green ch	op, etc. (see text)					
Geographic area	Fari	ms	Acre	S	Quantity			Farms			Acres		Quantity		/		
	Number	Relati standa error estima (percer	of ate	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Hundred	weight	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Number	Rela stand erro estin (perc	lard or of nate	Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Toi	ns, dry	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		
Rhode Island _ Bristol Kent Newport Providence Washington	19 - - 8 2 9	6 22	5.7	.2 - .2 (D) (D)		74 808 - - 33 423 (D) (D)	.1 - .2 (D) (D)	245 10 28 46 89 72		2.1 5.0 5.2 4.1 3.1 3.2	7 614 387 935 1 647 2 419 2 226	2.3 1.6 9.6 5.2 3.4 3.1		5 864 670 2 350 2 775 4 729 5 340	2.6 3.6 9.7 7.9 3.2 3.7		
						Se	lected crops I	harvested -C	on.								
			Vegetables harvest	ed for sale (see text)						Land in	orchards					
Geographic area		Farm	ns		Ac	res			Fai	ms			Ac	res			
_		Number	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		Number		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	1	Number		Relative standard error of estimate (percent	d f e	Number		Relative standard error of estimate (percent)		
Rhode Island _ Bristol Kent Newport Providence Washington		126 13 9 21 38 45	2.6 3.0 11.1 6.4 4.6 4.3		1 868 (D) (D) 359 276 612		2.6 (D) (D) 5.2 6.6 4.1		72 3 8 14 33 14		3.6 20.1 11.: 8.6 4.3	3 2 3 3	664 2 48 127 451 36		4.5 22.4 15.2 17.8 4.0 8.5		

¹Data are based on a sample of farms.

Table G. New England States' Estimates of the Not on the Mail List Component of Farm Coverage Error: 1992

[Detail may not add to total due to rounding. For meaning of abbreviations and symbols, see introductory text]

	Census published farms		Not on mail list ¹		Percent not on mail list ¹	
Item	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (number)	Relative standard error of estimate (percent)	Total (percent)	Standard error of percent
Farmsnumber_	22 991	.4	5 422	12.5	19.1	2.0
Land in farmsacres	3 857 438	.3	314 720	21.7	7.5	1.4
Average size of farmacres	167.8	.5	58.0	16.8	(X)	(X)
Farms by size: Less than 10 acres 10 to 49 acres Less than 50 acres 50 acres or more 50 to 99 acres 100 to 179 acres 180 acres or more	2 843 5 597 8 440 14 551 3 800 3 874 6 877	.8 .6 .4 .6 .6	1 229 2 491 3 720 1 702 688 674 339	29.5 18.7 15.3 22.2 37.4 32.6 48.6	30.2 30.8 30.6 10.5 15.3 14.8 4.7	6.6 4.0 3.3 2.1 5.1 4.2 2.1
Harvested cropland farms acres	19 644	.4	3 927	14.9	16.7	2.1
	1 312 694	.2	63 683	19.9	4.6	.9
Farms by value of sales: Less than \$1,000 \$1,000 to \$2,499 Less than \$2,500 \$2,500 or more \$2,500 to \$9,999 \$10,000 or more	3 770	.8	2 192	20.0	36.8	4.7
	3 041	.8	1 238	29.1	28.9	5.8
	6 811	.7	3 431	16.0	33.5	3.6
	16 180	.4	1 991	19.8	11.0	1.9
	5 776	.6	1 218	25.8	17.4	3.7
	10 404	.3	773	34.7	6.9	2.3
Market value of agricultural products sold\$1,000	1 686 781	.1	27 166	30.0	1.6	.5
Farms by standard industrial classification: Crops (01) Livestock (02)	12 093	.5	2 221	19.3	15.5	2.5
	10 898	.4	3 201	17.2	22.7	3.1
Farms by type of organization: Individual or family Partnership or corporation Other	19 403	.4	4 857	13.0	20.0	2.1
	3 368	.5	460	50.0	12.0	5.0
	220	1.8	—	(X)	–	(X)
Farms by tenure of operator: Full owners Part owners and tenants Part owners Tenants	14 362	.5	3 963	15.0	21.6	2.6
	8 629	.4	1 457	23.3	14.4	2.8
	7 037	.4	1 148	25.8	14.0	3.0
	1 592	.8	309	48.2	16.2	6.7
Operators by place of residence: On farm operated Not on farm operated Not reported	18 979	.4	4 837	13.2	20.3	2.2
	2 824	.6	281	45.6	9.1	3.8
	1 188	.9	303	61.6	20.3	9.5
Operators by principal occupation: Farming Other	12 774	.4	1 971	23.6	13.4	2.8
	10 217	.6	2 925	17.3	22.3	3.0
Operators by sex: Male Female	19 820	.4	4 825	13.1	19.6	2.1
	3 171	.7	597	34.5	15.9	4.6
Operators by race: WhiteBlack and other races	22 909 82	.4 3.6	4 895	13.3 (X)	17.6	1.9 (X)
Operators by years on present farm: 4 years or less 5 years or more Average years on present farm	2 150	.9	1 129	29.7	34.4	6.7
	17 693	.4	3 339	15.7	15.9	2.2
	19.6	.6	16.0	13.3	(X)	(X)
Not reported	3 148	.6	954	29.7	23.3	5.3
Average age of operator	53.2	.6	53.4	4.3	(X)	(X)

Note: These estimates do not account for incorrectly classified farms or farms appearing more than once in the census and are subject to change in the 1992 Coverage Evaluation publication. See appendix C text for further explanation.

Note: New England States include Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

¹Estimates are based on a sample survey conducted independently of census data collection.